



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be; both have kept the ancient punctuation "parce qu'elle repose sur de meilleurs principes que celle en usage aujourd'hui;" as Prof. Cornu says. The latter scholar has also distinguished between *u* and *v*, and used capital letters with proper names; this Sr. Martínez Salazar has not done, as it is not done in the manuscript. A comparison of the two texts shows very slight differences, and is a proof of the minute and painstaking care of Sr. Salazar and M. Cornu.

In the following notes, I give the text of Salazar first. Always *aujan*, C. *aviian* and *avian*; *vijnān*: *vinā*; *vijr*: *vir*; *desparesca* (308): *desperesca*; *duron* (308) misprint, C. has *droun*; *da sua parte*: *de*. Salazar always uses the Spanish form *por*, while Cornu nearly always has *per*; *porla*: *pela*; *çerca* (309) typ. error, C. has *çerta*; *rrecebedes* (309) correct, C. has *rreceberdes*; *guerra* (309) should be *queyra*, the subjunctive, as in C.; *home*: *homen* always. The final *e* of adverbs is always omitted in S. *apostament*, *adeant*, etc. Cornu nearly always represents the final *n* by a tilde. *retrando et posfacado* (312): *rretrauda et posfacada*, as it should be; it is Breçayda who is speaking. *eemjgos*: *ëemigos*; *ajudadeslos para seer*: *ajudadelos*, the former is correct; *avedes*: *aviedes* (10) is a misprint; *homes*: *homens* always; *escarnido*: *escarnudo*, the former a misprint. *deteemento*, *deteer*, *teemos*: *detëemento*, *detëer*, *tëemos*; *amjude*: *amitude*; *mereçesse* (321): *merçesse* (14); *perssiãos*: *Perssãos*; *mill*: *mille*; *dulgas*: *Dulgos*; *poru*: *peru*. On p. 321, l. 25, we have the spelling *elmos de panja*, where the variant given is *panjo*—and in the vocabulary the correction is indicated: error for *panja*: Cornu has *elmos de Pavia*; cf. the name of the trobador *Joham Soares de Pauha*, *Payva*, *Pavia*.

Both of these publications are the work of scholars from whom we may expect the greatest accuracy, and both are most welcome—the briefer excerpts from the MS. especially to those to whom the larger publication is inaccessible. Prof. Cornu gives only the text, with some important remarks at the end, concerning his system of transcription.

The work of Srs. Rodriguez and Martínez Salazar is truly monumental: it is magnificently printed in two large folio volumes. The

whole is preceded by an excellent grammar of the old Galician dialect, over eighty-five pages folio, from the pen of the well known scholar, D. Manuel R. Rodriguez, whose blindness has in nowise impaired the extreme care and accuracy with which he has preformed his task. The vocabulary, prepared by the same grammarian, is also singularly complete and admirably done. We have already spoken of the great accuracy and trustworthiness of the text presented to us by the learned editor, Don Andrés Martínez Salazar. It is what we should expect from a scholar of such high reputation as a paleographer. But Sr. Salazar has not only given us the whole of the Galician text as represented by the Madrid manuscript; this, as is well known, is incomplete at the beginning. Of these opening chapters that are missing—thirty-four in number—he supplies the Spanish text from the MS. in the Escorial, as an Appendix to his work, and in another appendix gives such chapters as are contained in the bilingual MS.—Galician and Castilian, belonging to Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo, and which are not found in the Madrid text. The introduction contains a detailed description of the manuscripts, and a very interesting account of his treatment of the various abbreviations and diacritical marks of the codex. Taking it all in all, the *Cronica Troyana* does great honor to Spanish scholarship and also to the Deputation of the Province of Coruña, through whose munificence this—one of the most important monuments of the old Galician dialect, has been made accessible.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

LITERATURE IN THE SOUTH.

Selections from the Southern Poets, selected and edited by WILLIAM LANDER WEBER, Emory College, Ga. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. 16mo., pp. 1+221, 25 cents.

"THIS book," says Dr. Weber, "is intended primarily to meet the recommendation of the Georgia Teachers' Association that applicants for admission into the Freshman Class of Georgia colleges be examined on selections from Southern poets. Yet the anthology is not compiled in a sectional spirit; for limited

as was the literary expression of the old South, it has not, as a rule, had adequate attention; and it is believed that there will be a demand for such a book wherever there is desire to study American literature."

That there will be a wide demand for this attractive little book hardly admits of a doubt. Hitherto the writings of Southern poets have not been accessible to students and general readers except in Clarke's *Songs of the South* (1896), an admirable book but a trifle too costly to be used widely in secondary schools. Miss Clarke's anthology, moreover, though it contains a biographical appendix, has no notes, the latter being a commendable feature of Dr. Weber's edition.

Twenty-five poets are represented and, while it would be easy to name not a few genuine poems (not poets) that the editor has omitted, it is doubtful whether his one hundred and ninety pages of text could have been better filled. His notes and biographical sketches are accurate, he makes no unwarranted claims for his authors, he never sacrifices literary judgment to sectional patriotism, and, so far as I have observed, there are but three typographical errors: "songs" for "song" (p. 65, l. 10), the omission of "forty" before "nights" (p. 75, l. 4), and "craftmanship" for "craftsmanship" (p. 196, l. 7). There is, however, here and there an infelicity of diction that could easily be removed in a second edition. Thus, for example, in the Preface (p. xiii):

"In the midst of this happiness his habits of using excitants returned, and the position on the *Messenger* was soon lost. The foregoing sentence has told in short the sad story of the remaining thirteen years of Poe's life."

The following note (p. 191) was read many times before the meaning dawned:

"Homer impresses us with the beauty of Helen of Troy by reporting as warriors men too old for battle saying: 'Small blame is it Trojans and well-greaved Achaeans should for such a woman long time suffer hardships.'"

There are, it seems to me, two defects in Dr. Weber's book, though I have already shown my appreciation of its value by ordering more than one hundred copies for supplementary reading in my Freshman study of American literature: 1. It should be prefaced

by an introductory review of literary conditions in the South before and after 1870.¹ The anthology needs such a setting in order to explain the comparative dearth of poetry in the South and to throw around the selections the historical environment necessary to their adequate interpretation. The biographical sketches are helps but they do not entirely compass the need; they do not enable the student to view Southern literature as an evolution, to understand the literary isolation of ante-bellum days, the causes of the recent renaissance, the growing sense of literary community, the changed attitude toward literature as a profession, the rise and decay of sectionalism, the increasing fidelity of Southern writers since the Civil War to what they have seen, heard, and know. A sketch of this sort, and Dr. Weber is abundantly able to write it, would supply background and perspective for every poem in the collection and be itself a needed chapter in the history of American literature.

2. The short bibliography given suggests the advisability either of entire omission or at least of radical change. Such entries as "Lanier: *Poems*," "Russell: *Poems*," "Ryan: *Poems*" add nothing to the completeness of the bibliography; and the special studies in individual poets, which make up most of the twenty-five works listed, had much better appear under the corresponding biographies than be collected here at the end. The separate space devoted to bibliography would then be reserved for the publications that treat either Southern literature as a whole or some particular problem or aspect of this literature. Such a bibliography would include, to mention only the works that Dr. Weber has omitted, Baskervill's "Southern Literature" (*Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, viii); Bradshaw's *Southern Poetry prior to 1860* (B. F. Johnson Co.: 1900); Coleman's "The Recent Movement in the Literature of the South" (*Harper's Monthly*, May, 1887); Hale's

¹ I have attempted to show the significance of this date as regards the renaissance of Southern literature in "The Possibilities of the South in Literature" (*Sewanee Review*, July, 1898) and "The Historical Element in Recent Southern Literature" (*Publications of the Mississippi Historical Soc.*, Vol. ii, 1899).

"The Poetry of the South" (*Methodist Review*, Nos. 151 and 152, Nashville, Tenn.); W. D. Howells's "The Southern States in Recent American Literature" (*Literature*, Sept. 10, 1898: Harper and Brothers); Ingle's *Southern Sidelights* (T. Y. Crowell: 1896); Kent's *The Revival of Interest in Southern Letters* (B. F. Johnson Co.: 1899); Mabie's "Literature in the South" (*The Outlook*, Dec. 2, 1899: reprinted by B. F. Johnson Co.: 1900); Manly's *Southern Literature from 1579 to 1895* (B. F. Johnson Co.: 1895); Brander Matthews's *Aspects of Fiction* (Harper and Brothers, 1896: cap. ii is a discussion of Page's "Old South" and Trent's *William Gilmore Simms*); Page's *The Old South* (Charles Scribner's Sons: 1896); and Tourgee's "The South as a Field for Fiction" (*The Forum*, Dec., 1888).

This list is not exhaustive but it is inexpensive, easily accessible, and represents, so far as I know, the best that has been said on the general subject of literature in the South. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that in this literature may be found the key to certain phases of social and institutional history in the South.² Were this literature more read *as history*, there would be less complaint that the rising generation is ignorant of its own history. "It is a trite saying," says Dr. James A. H. Murray (*The Evolution of English Lexicography*, p. 24) "that 'they do these things better in France';" but it is, nevertheless, sometimes true. Amid all the changes of government which France has seen in modern times, it has never been forgotten that the history of the French language, and of French letters and French science, is part of the history of France; the British government has not even now attained to the standpoint of recognizing this: among the historical documents published under the direction of the authorities of the Record Office, there is no series illustrating the history of the language, the literature, or the science of England."

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

Louisiana State University.

² No one appreciated this fact more than the lamented Dr. Herbert B. Adams, former Professor of History in the Johns Hopkins University—a man whose genial nature and inspiring example will live forever in the hearts of those who sat under him. At his request I mailed him a few years ago a long list of Southern novels, books of poems, and other literature that mirrored faithfully the life, traditions, and institutions of the South. He at once purchased them all and placed them in the University library as material for the study of Southern history.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Le Chevalier à l'Épée: An Old French Poem, edited by EDWARD COOKE ARMSTRONG. (Johns Hopkins University Dissertation, 1897.) Baltimore, 1900. 8vo, 72 pp.

THE present editor is the fourth to publish in full a poem belonging to the group of minor Arthurian romances. The anonymous author of the *Chevalier à l'Épée* imitates Chrétien de Troies both in content and language. In some twelve hundred lines, he devotes himself to setting forth, in a style which can claim to be little more than a pale reflection of Chrétien's artful narrative, a trio of somewhat disconnected adventures whose hero is the mundane Gauvain. The editor has made close and careful studies of: 1. the language of the author; 2. the language of the copyist; 3. the literary-historical features of the poem, examining particularly the three main episodes above referred to.

This work has been fortunate enough to obtain thorough-going criticisms from Profs. G. Paris¹ and A. Mussafia (the latter as reported by Dr. E. Herzog).² The former speaks in deservedly high terms of the permanent value of Mr. Armstrong's work on the poem. It would be surprising if there were anything of importance to glean in the track of these scholars; in fact, there is very little indeed. The interest of the publication, however, encourages me to add a few remarks on the wording of the text, and on certain outward features of the English commentaries.

Line 176: it seems more prudent not to assume *v* in *seure*, *siure*, nor in *roua* 374, *trines* 673, etc.; 184 better *dit* (and *ocit* 540); for the confusion, cf. *ocist*, just below; 275 *le* (G. Paris) is almost certainly required. The passage closely resembles *Erec et Enide*, ll. 443-449. (It would have been interesting if more of these verbal parallels could have been noticed in the "Notes to the Text.") Lines 289-90 *jalos: vos*. The meaning of the remark on this rime (p. 52) is not clear to me. As *jaleus* is known later (in spite of modern French *jalous*) the rime is the same as 677-8 *angoissos*:

¹ *Romania* xxix, pp. 593-600.

² *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur* xxii², pp. 151-155.